

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of September 14, 2006 is respectfully requested.

In item 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the USPTO has no record of the IDS filed February 23, 2004. Accordingly, the Applicant has re-submitted herewith a copy of the IDS initially filed February 23, 2004, along with the date-stamped post card which provides evidence that the IDS was submitted on the indicated date. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the references listed on the 1449 of the IDS, and provide an initialed copy of the Form 1449 with the next communication.

In item 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, it appears that the Examiner is taking the position that the meaning of the phrase “separably positioned” as set forth in claim 1 is unclear. As will be explained in more detail below, independent claim 1 has been cancelled, but the subject matter recited therein has been incorporated into claim 10. Although the Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner’s position, the phrase “separably positioned” has nonetheless now been clarified to read “so as to be capable of being separated from the surface of the carrier base” in amended claim 10. In view of this modification, it is submitted that the Examiner’s formal rejections of the original claims have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 8, and 9 as being anticipated by the Suzuki reference (US 5,021,296), but also indicated that dependent claims 10-14 contain allowable subject matter. Consequently, the claims have now been amended as explained below.

In view of the Examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter, claim 10 has now been amended so as to be placed in independent form including all of the limitations of original base independent claim 1. In this regard, although the original language of claim 1 has been slightly modified so as to address the Examiner’s formal rejection as noted above, no attempt has been made to modify the scope of original claim 1. Therefore, in view of the Examiner’s indication of allowable subject matter, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 10 and dependent claims 2 and 11-14 which depend therefrom are now in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideki HIGASHITANI

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm
Registration No. 44,142
Attorney for Applicant

WDH/ck
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 13, 2006